

### REMARKS

The Office Action mailed October 3, 2002 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1 to 29 remain pending. Of these, claims 1, 14, 19, 20, 24, 25 and 29 are independent claims.

Reconsideration of the above-identified application, in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

A change of correspondence address is enclosed, including a request to change the attorney docket number.

Claims 1, 2, 14, 19, 20, 21, 24 to 26, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,356,773 to Rinot ("Rinot").

The invention recited in claim 1 provides an "active shield substantially canceling the effects of the electromagnetic field in a predetermined region." Field effects cancellation performed by the active shield is discussed in the specification at, for example, page 4 in lines 5 to 7 and page 4, line 21 to page 5, line 2.

Rinot, by contrast, is directed to a passive shield that blocks RF emissions. The Rinot shield achieves this RF emissions blocking by reflecting or absorbing electromagnetic radiation (col. 5, lines 23 to 24), by virtue of the materials from which the Rinot shield is made. Rinot fails to disclose an "active" shield and furthermore fails to disclose any structure for "canceling the effects of the electromagnetic field", as is expressly required by the language of claim 1. Accordingly, Rinot fails to anticipate the invention as recited in claim 1, which is deemed to be patentable over Rinot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of that rejection is respectfully requested.

Each of independent claims 14, 19, 20, 24, 25 and 29, likewise specify "canceling the effects of the electromagnetic field in a predetermined region", and are each therefore also deemed to be patentable over Rinot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these additional claims is therefore respectfully requested.

As to claims 2, 21 and 26, each depends from, and therefore includes all of the limitations of, respective base claims 1, 20 and 25, and are therefore likewise deemed to be patentable over Rinot.

Claims 3 to 5, 15 to 18, 22, 23, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Rinot in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,697,083 to Sano ("Sano").

The Office Action states on page 4 that, although Rinot fails to disclose an adjustment circuit for adjusting the phase of the signal, Sanot provides this disclosure and the cited claims would have been obvious over Rinot in view of Sanot.

Sanot is directed to a diversity receiver that takes account of reliability information, such as the signal-to-noise ratio, to combine signals incoming from plural antennae after the signals have been phase adjusted. Sanot's phase adjustment allows separately received signals to be combined in-phase (col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 21). This is a very different function from the phase adjustment that is performed in the present invention, which is discussed in the instant specification at, for example, page 4, line 21 to page 5, line 2. Although Sanot relates to communication by electromagnetic radiation, Sanot appears to bear no further relevance to applicants' invention as recited in any of claims 1 to 29.

In particular, Sanot fails to remedy the deficiencies discussed above in Rinot, since Sanot fails to disclose, *inter alia*, "canceling the effects of the electromagnetic field in a predetermined region" as explicitly required by the language in all of applicants' base claims.

Claims 3 to 5, 15 to 18, 22, 23, 27 and 28, which respectively depend from base claims 1, 14, 20 and 25, are accordingly deemed to be patentable over the Examiner's proffered combination of references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 6 to 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Rinot in view of Sano and U.S. Patent No. 5,995,854 to Wilson ("Wilson").

Wilson relates to a communication device shielding accessory, such as a micro-screen with apertures sized to block RF radiation without blocking sound or light waves (col. 3, lines 51 to 54). Wilson fails to remedy the deficiencies discussed above in Rinot and Sano, since Wilson fails to disclose, *inter alia*, "canceling the effects of the electromagnetic field in a predetermined region" as explicitly required by the language of base claim 1, from which claims 6 to 13 depend. These claims are accordingly deemed to be patentable over the cited combination of references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that this application is in condition for immediate allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in the event of any perceived outstanding issues so that passage of the case to issue can be effected without the need for a further Office Action.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application; however, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By  \_\_\_\_\_

Lance J. Lieberman  
Reg. No. 28,437  
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210  
New York, New York 10176  
(212) 687-2770

Dated: December 27, 2002